DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 241 EC 201 702

AUTHOR Jones, Joan
TITLE Improving Services to Learning Disabled Students at Oxnard College through the Identification of Referral Sources. Learning Theory.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 35p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University. For a related paper, see EC 201 701.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Curriculum Development; *Delivery Systems; Identification; *Learning Disabilities; Postsecondary Education; *Referral; *Student College Relationship; Student Recruitment; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS Oxnard College CA

ABSTRACT

In order to improve services to learning disabled (LD) students in a California community college setting (and to recruit new students as well as carry out ongoing curriculum adaptations), the study sought to identify sources of referral of LD students to the college special education department. Following a review of relevant literature, data from student files on referral sources of 73 LD students currently enrolled at the college were analyzed. The source of referral of the greatest number of LD students was the college's own Divisions (math/science, vocational/technical, counseling, and essential skills), with local high schools ranking second, other (peers and Department of Social Welfare) ranking third, self-referral fourth, parents/relatives fifth, and the Department of Rehabilitation referring the least number of students. Among recommendations are greater sharing of information on learning disabilities, and initiation of efforts to increase LD enrollment at the institution by extended outreach programs to low identified sources of referral. (JW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED290241

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

# IMPROVING SERVICES TO LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS AT OXNARD COLLEGE THROUGH THE IDENTIFICATION OF REFERRAL SOURCES

LEARNING THEORY

by

Joan Jones, M.S.
Oxnard College

John West, Ed.D.
Santa Ana Cluster

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY
APRIL 1987

EC 201702

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joan Jones
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

College students identified as having specific learning disabilities are enrolling in postsecondary education institutions in greater numbers than ever before. The participation of these special learners in college is now demanding a re-evaluation of the types of programs and services offered. The single most critical barrier to the provision of equitable programs and services to the learning disabled student in the California Community Colleges has been the variability of identification procedures and criteria from campus to campus.

The purpose of this study was to identify the sources of referral for the learning disabled student at Oxnard College. The study identified the percentage and rank-order of who is referring the learning disabled students to the Oxnard College Special Education Office. Procedures included a review of literature that 1) determined the appropriate sources of referral for the learning disabled student, 2) how to identify learning disabled students, and 3) cross-disciplinary approaches with faculty and other referral sources focusing on the learning disabled student. The procedures also included a review of the Special Education case files on those

students identified as Learning Disabled Average (LDA). The sources of referral were rated as follows on the survey instrument: 1) Self-referral, 2) Parents/relatives, 3) Department of Rehabilitation, 4) High Schools, 5) Counselors, 6) Division, and 7) Other. Additionally, the section labeled "Division" on the survey instrument was separately calculated in the same manner. This allowed the study greater impact in that total sources of referral on campus were also specifically noted.

The results of the study indicated that the sources of referral for LDA students at Oxnard College, in rank order, were: 1) Division, 2) High School, 3) Others (Peers and Social Welfare Agency), 4) Self-referral, 5) Parents/ relatives, and 6) Department of Rehabilitation. The sources of referral on campus, by Division, in rank order, were as follows: 1) Math/Science, 2) Vocational/Technical, 3) Counseling and 4) Essential Skills.

The following recommendations were made based on the results and interpretations of the study: 1) The Special Education Department share the results of this study with the entire faculty, 2) The Special Education Department share the results with the entire administration, 3) The Special Education Department work more closely with the Counseling and Essential Skills Division in providing more background on LDA students--through workshops, seminars and literature, 4) More communication and literature could be shared with the faculty on learning

disabled programs impact on retention, the classroom, and the institution as a whole, 5) Increase the LDA enrollment at the institution by extended outreach programs to low identified sources of referral, 6) Consider using academically successful LDA students in both community and institution outreach/information endeavors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


Page

INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1

Statement of the Problem. . . . . 3

Background and Significance . . . . . 5

Literature Review . . . . . 7

Legislation . . . . . 9

Sources of Referral for Learning Disabled Students 11

Identification of Learning Disabled Students. . . 12

Expanding Beyond the Special Education Classroom: A Crossdisciplinary Approach 13

PROCEDURES . . . . . 16

Limitations and Assumptions of the Investigation. 17

Definition of Terms . . . . . 18

FINDINGS . . . . . 20

Findings From the Review of Literature. . . . . 20

Findings From the Data Analysis . . . . . 21

Table 1 Source of Referral for Oxnard College LDA Student (In Rank Order) 21

Table 2 Source of Referral for Oxnard College LDA Student From Campus Divisions (In Rank Order) 22

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . 24

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 28

## INTRODUCTION

College students identified as having specific learning disabilities are enrolling in postsecondary education institutions in greater numbers than ever before (Ostertag and Baker, 1984). The participation of these special learners in college is now demanding a re-evaluation of the types of programs and services offered. According to Cordoni (1982) and Mangrum and Strichart (1984), there is a minimum of such programming and services nationwide, despite the increasing demand for postsecondary participation by these adults with learning disabilities. However, this trend is not true in California; where the community colleges have been providing categorical funding for extensive services for the past fifteen years for students identified as having specific learning disabilities.

The term "learning disabled" has been recently redefined by the Chancellor's Offices of the Community Colleges and is presently still in a state of transition. The Chancellor's Office definition includes a clear association of specific learning disabilities with neurological dysfunction. This definition is an attempt by the Community College Chancellor's Office to delineate

characteristics that are unique to the adult population observed in the community college setting.

Oxnard College's Special Education Department provides a wide variety of specialized educational services for the learning disabled college student. The learning disabled student population in the California Community Colleges has grown from 7,962 to 11,876 students, from 1981 to 1985, a 49 percent growth in five years (Ostertag, 1986).

The single most critical barrier to the provision of equitable programs and services to the learning disabled student in the California Community Colleges has been the variability of identification procedures and criteria from campus to campus (Ostertag, 1986). Once a learning disabled student is identified and appropriately referred to Oxnard College's Special Education program, the intervention and remediation process can begin, which greatly enhances this individual's retention in college and success in coursework.

An awareness of this academic need is widespread, and the need is real. The learning disabled student whose aspirations never included a higher education until open admissions and federal funds came into existence, are appearing in every program and course on the community college campuses (Hartman, Krulwich, 1984). Results of the most recent studies undertaken by the California Community Colleges offer evidence that a lack of consistency exists in all areas of service delivery to the

learning disabled community college student (Ostertag, 1986). The basis of this difficulty may rest in the lack of useful identification methods for the adult learning disabled person.

The identification of the sources of referral for the learning disabled student would be of great value to the special education educators at Oxnard College in curriculum and service planning as well as in the recruitment for these individuals.

## Statement of the Problem

The Special Education Educators at Oxnard College have met with barriers to the provision of equitable services for their learning disabled students to the variability of identification procedures and criteria campus to campus. Using PL94-142 guidelines to identify learning disabled college students has proven problematic for Oxnard College.

Johnston (1984) noted that as a result of community demands and government legislation, secondary schools have developed programs for the handicapped that are often inappropriate and poorly planned. Similarly, the Inspector General noted that "...special education programs are weak at the junior high and high school levels." (Education of the Handicapped Amendments, 1983:19). There is growing concern that postsecondary programs will be faced with dilemmas similar to those at the secondary level. Problems are particularly apparent with respect to the unresolved issues of diagnosis and identification, and the

consequent planning of appropriate and meaningful instruction. It is, therefore, not surprising that a major text in L.D. college programming notes that many "so-called" programs do not actually meet the demands of postsecondary learning disabled students (Mangrum and Strichart, 1984) nor that Chandler (1985) finds the search for adequate L.D. college programs frustrating at best.

The identified sources of referral will assist the special education department serving the learning disabled students in the following ways:

1) To analyze what those identified as "high" sources of referral are doing to identify the learning disabled student. This information then may be able to be utilized for the purposes of increasing the lower sources of referral.

2) To determine what "low" sources of referral specifically require so as to increase the number of identified learning disabled students.

3) Assist in providing more continuity and an upgrading of the services already provided to the learning disabled student.

It is important to train those individuals who work with the learning disabled on some level and one approach is said to require cross-disciplinary efforts with input from counseling, school psychology, higher education, special education and rehabilitation (Shaw, Norlander, (1985).

## Background and Significance

Learning handicapped individuals of college age are attending postsecondary institutions in increasing numbers (Black, 1982). The increased enrollment has been encouraged in part by the provisions of Section 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Section 503 disallows job discrimination because of handicap and requires affirmative action to employ and advance in employment qualified handicapped individuals. Section 504 is designed to provide equal opportunity to handicapped individuals in any program or activity receiving or benefiting from federal financial assistance. Enrollment patterns of handicapped students illustrate the reasoning behind the passage of Section 504. Learning handicapped students avoid postsecondary institutions where program accessibility is limited (Black, 1982).

Students with learning disabilities are going to college, succeeding there, and graduating. They are going to all types of colleges and universities, participating increasingly in the mainstream of college life. With appropriate knowledge about college programs for students with learning disabilities, the right preparation, and proper guidance, learning disabled students can choose a suitable college, major in any area of study, and graduate successfully. Today, learning disabled students are also going to graduate school. Some are becoming attorneys, others physicians, and still others engineers

and architects. For the learning disabled student who receives the proper support and guidance, the world of opportunity is rapidly expanding (Hartman and Krulwich, 1984).

Even with the potential to succeed in college, most learning disabled students take more than the usual four years to complete their studies. (Magrum & Strichart, 1984). Frequently they take a reduced course load of 9 credits, rather than the usual 15 credits. The reading, writing, and study demands of a full college course load are more than typical learning disabled students can handle at first (Johnston, 1984). To help such students make the difficult transition from high school to college, programs for learning disabled students provide intensive services during the freshman and sophomore years. These services are gradually phased out as learning disabled students progress through college. To assist L.D. students in making the difficult transition from high school to college, programs for learning disabled students must provide intensive services during the student's initial enrollment into college (Vetter, 1983). These services then can be gradually phased out as the learning disabled student progresses through college, only when the individual becomes more capable and comfortable with coursework (Vetter, 1983).

Oxnard College's Special Education enrollment has increased its learning disabled population by 42 percent

over the past four years (1982 to 1986). Therefore, the identification of the sources of referral for the learning disabled student at Oxnard College was deemed significant, not only to assist students in continuity of services, but also in the curriculum, service planning, and recruitment for these individuals as well.

## Literature Review

The field of learning disabilities dates from 1963 and is relatively young by any standard, and the creation of programs for learning disabled college students is an even more recent development (Blalock, 1980). In 1970, Dr. Gertrude Webb began the first full-fledged college program for learning disabled students at Curry College in Milton, Massachusetts (Ausubel, 1968). Dr. Webb was one of the first to recognize that many learning disabled students had both the ability and the desire to go to college. She believed that they deserved an opportunity to get a college education and could in fact, achieve a college degree if provided with the compensatory assistance they needed to meet the demands of college. Since that time, a rapidly increasing number of colleges and universities throughout the United States have begun to provide special services for students with learning disabilities (Blalock, 1980).

There are studies that show that as many as two thirds of young adults diagnosed as learning disabled have a desire to extend their education beyond high

school (Dunn, 1973). As college officials became aware of the large number of learning disabled students with college aspirations, they looked for ways their colleges could meet the needs of these students. Parents and professionals brought considerable pressure upon colleges and universities to offer programs for learning disabled students (Blalock, 1980). The work of a number of organizations composed of parents and professionals concerned with the learning disabled has added immeasurably to the impetus of colleges to provide special services (Cordoni, 1979). There are many organizations that have worked on behalf of the learning disabled. Some, such as the following, have had particular success in bringing about increased services and opportunities for learning disabled students at the college level: (Cordoni, 1979)

1) Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities
2) Association of Learning Disabled Adults
3) Foundation for Children with Learning Disabilities
4) Orton Dyslexia Society
5) The Puzzle People
6) Time Out to Enjoy

As colleges experienced a decline in enrollment, they began looking for new sources of students (Cordoni, 1982). Convinced that many learning disabled students could succeed in college and being aware of the large number of these students, many colleges began to develop the support

services needed to help these students succeed (Freston and Drew, 1974). As it became apparent that learning disabled students were succeeding in college, the desire of college officials to attract these students increased.

## Legislation

Clearly the most significant factor leading to the development of college programs for learning disabled students has been strong federal legislation (Cordoni, 1982). The two most important laws are Public Law 94-142 (PL 94-142), discussed above and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (PL 93-112). PL 94-142 has been referred to as the Bill of Rights for the handicapped because it guarantees to all handicapped individuals, including the learning disabled students a free and appropriate education through the secondary level. As a result of this law, many learning disabled students attended regular high school classes with students who were not learning disabled (Blalock, 1980). As they did, they acquired many of the academic skills that would enable them to attend college. PL 94-142 has, therefore, had an indirect effect on the development of college programs for the learning disabled. It has helped to produce a large number of learning disabled students with many necessary academic skills and the desire to attend college. As a natural outgrowth, many colleges have responded by developing programs to enable these students to do so (Cordoni, 1982).

Based upon mandates of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, it stipulates that "no qualified handicapped person shall, on the basis of handicap, be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity which receives or benefits from Federal assistance." Federal Register (1977:2678). Many learning disabled students are seeking full implementation of this statement in college settings (Gerber, 1981). Additionally, the availability of support services at the secondary level has contributed to the expectation that continued service will be provided in postsecondary environments (Vetter, 1983).

The growing numbers of L.D. students seeking college admission encouraged the Office of Special Education to stress the need for improvement in services designed to assist handicapped students in transition from high school to institutions of higher education (Education of the Handicapped, 1984). A survey by White, Alley, Deshler, Schumaker, Warner, and Clark (1982), reported that 67 percent of young adults diagnosed as learning disabled while in public school had plans for postsecondary education. In fact, the number of L.D. students entering college has more than doubled since 1978 (Education of the Handicapped Amendments, 1983). Of even greater concern to many college personnel are the sixteen million adults with learning disabilities who are characterized by

Fielding (1981) as the largest pool of undereducated but high potential persons in our country today.

Because of their varied characteristics and multiplicity of needs, learning disabled college students require a comprehensive support program. The components of such a program are diagnostic and prescriptive planning, advisement, counseling, remediation, tutoring, special courses, and a range of auxillary aids and services (Ostertag, 1984). If a college program for learning disabled students is to be considered comprehensive, the program must provide these components in a manner specifically designed to meet the needs of such students and be staffed with personnel with appropriate experience and training (Salend, Salend, and Yanoli, 1985).

Sources of Referral for Learning Disabled Students

In a study conducted by Bruce Ostertag (1986), several questionnaire items addressed the issue of identification. Those responding indicated that approximately ninety percent or more of the learning disabled referrals came from, in rank order: 1) Faculty, 2) Counselors, 3) High Schools, 4) Department of Rehabilitation, 5) Parents/relatives, and the L.D. students themselves. These results were virtually identical for the original 1982 survey conducted by Ostertag on the same subject matter. Two other referral groups rated fairly high as noted by Gregg (1982); Social Service Agencies and L.D. student peers.

Identification of Learning Disabled Students

Learning Disability, L.D., is a hidden handicap. Unlike the person who uses sign language or walks with crutches, the learning disabled person shows no visible characteristics of the disability (Hartman, Krulwich, 1984). The casual observer does not realize that difficulty in processing information causes the person to cope differently from others in learning and living situations (Vogel and Adelman, 1981). The following behavioral symptoms have been consistently associated with the learning disabled population: 1) hyperactivity, 2) short attention span, 3) auditory or visual perception disorders, 4) motor problems, 5) mixed lateral dominance, 6) memory disorders, 7) language disorders, and 8) social perception problems (Frostig and Maslow, 1973). Individuals with learning disabilities may have one or more of these characteristics in different combinations and with varying degrees of severity (Marsh, Gearhart, and Gearhart, 1978).

There is still considerable confusion and disagreement about the categories of symptomology that defines the population of children, adolescents and adults identified as learning disabled. Cruickshank (1977) feels that the major reason for this dilemma is that the federal guidelines under the current legislation have so broadly defined the definition of specific learning disability that many individuals are mistakenly included in this category. Thus, there is a need to streamline the

present definition so this area of specialization can be more accurately represented. Greater specificity will also help to facilitate research (Marsch, Gearhart, and Gearhart, 1978).

Ostertag, 1984, noted that community colleges have had difficulties in identifying the learning disabled student. Additionally, federal regulations do not adequately differentiate the learning disabled adult from the low achieving adult. There is a crucial need to design new diagnostic measures for L.D. adolescents and L.D. adults. One of the major reasons for confusion in diagnosis is the lack of refinement and sophistication in terms of being able to accurately differentiate between primary neurological indicators and secondary emotional symptomology (Johnston, 1984).

Expanding Beyond the Special Education Classroom:

A Crossdisciplinary Approach

Learning disabled college students typically manifest an array of academic problems including deficits in the areas of reading, writing, oral language, math and study skills, as indicated earlier. It is also apparent that social-emotional traits are, at least, of equal concern. Social characteristics that have been identified include low self-esteem, dependency, poor attention, emotional instability, and social imperception resulting in communication difficulties (Polloway, Smith and Patton, 1984). These combined needs suggest that interventions

for this population must be varied and comprehensive. Training programs, therefore, must be crossdisciplinary with input from counseling, school psychology, higher education and rehabilitation, as well as special education. Competencies for direct service personnel include assessment (academic, social and vocational) of adults, implementing academic and learning strategies, interventions, individual and group counseling, and consultation with College faculty.

As learning disabled students are increasingly seeking postsecondary education, additional trained personnel will be required to meet this demand. The implementation of a crossdisciplinary training effort is suggested as critical to the development of programs for this population of college or university students (Shaw, Norlander, 1985). It also goes hand in hand with identifying sources of referral for the learning disabled student; a critical component to ensure program continuity and quality services (Ostertag, Baker, Howard and Best, 1982).

It was evident from the literature review that California has been the only state to develop and implement a specific plan of action for providing equitable services to adults with learning disabilities in a postsecondary system (Ostertag, 1984). Currently, according to the State Chancellor's Office, 104 of the 106 community colleges in California provide support services

to a total disabled student population of 50,000, of which 11,000 are learning disabled students. Furthermore, out of the 106 campuses, 90 offer formal programs and services for the L.D. adult. However, results of the most recent studies undertaken by California, according to the Chancellor's Office, offer evidence that a lack of consistency exists in all areas of service delivery to the L.D. community college students. The basis of this difficulty may rest in the lack of identification procedures from campus to campus. Therefore, identification of sources of referral for the learning disabled student at Oxnard College was deemed significant.

## PROCEDURES

A review of literature was conducted to determine appropriate sources of referral for the learning disabled student. The literature review included readings on: 1) sources of referral for learning disabled students, 2) how to identify learning disabled students, and 3) crossdisciplinary approaches with faculty and other referral sources focusing on the learning disabled student. The resources utilized for the literature search included the libraries of the California State University Los Angeles, California State University Northridge, and University of California Los Angeles. A Lancers Data Base search was also utilized through the Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools.

The descriptive method of research was used. A review of the current literature combined with a survey instrument delineating possible sources of referral were the major components used to develop the findings and prepare a set of recommendations that will be submitted to the appropriate Oxnard College Administration. The focus of this research was to identify sources of referral of the learning disabled student to the Oxnard College Special Education Department with implication for improving the department's services.

The special education case files on those students identified Learning Disabled Average (LDA) were noted to be 73 students. Those files were checked to obtain the sources of referral. Learning disabled students whose case files did not have the referral source clearly identified, were called and asked as to the source of their referral to the Special Education Department. Student input was deemed most appropriate for this survey because the student's perception as to who directed them to special services was defined as the source of referral in this study.

The sources of referral were listed as follows on the survey instrument:

1) Self-referral, 2) Parents/relatives, 3) Department of Rehabilitation, 4) High Schools, 5) Counselor, 6) Division, and 7) Other. Percentages were calculated for each source of referral. The sources of referral were then placed in rank order. Additionally, the section labeled "Division" on the survey instrument was separately calculated in the same manner. Each division that referred students had percentages calculated for it and then was placed in rank order. This allowed the study greater impact in that <u>total</u> sources of referral were identified and sources of referral <u>on campus</u> were specifically noted.

<u>Limitations and Assumptions of the Investigation</u>

The numerical data obtained on sources of referral

in this study were limited specifically to learning disabled students for the fall of 1986 semester at Oxnard College.

It was assumed that all data obtained from student files was accurate and accurately recorded.

## Definition of Terms

In initiating the study, some basic terms were identified to assist in understanding the intent and purpose of the study and assist in interpreting the results. The selected terms are listed below:

Community College Learning Disabled Student (LDA): A community college student who falls within the definitional guidelines developed by the California Association of Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled (CAPED), Learning Disabilities Division, and adopted by the Community College Chancellor's Office as follows:

> A specific learning disability refers to disorders in which an individual exhibits a significant/severe discrepancy between the current level of developed intellectual abilities and academic performances despite regular instruction and educational opportunity, as currently measured by professionally recognized diagnostic procedures. Academic performances refer to achievement in the following areas: listening comprehension, oral expression, written expression, basic reading comprehension, mathematical calculation and reasoning. Specific Learning Disabilities are often due to constitutional, genetic and/or neurological factors and are not primarily due to: visual or auditory sensory deficits, motor handicaps, severe emotional disturbance, environmental or economic disadvantage, cultural/language difference, or mental retardation (1982).

Source(s) of Referral: Individuals, agencies, departments and/or divisions that identify a "possible"

learning disabled student and refer that individual to the Oxnard College Special Education Department.

## FINDINGS

### Findings From the Review of Literature

For this study, the single most critical barrier to the provision of equitable programs and services to the learning disabled student in California Community Colleges has been the variability of identification procedures and criteria from campus to campus. The literature review indicated that as learning disabled students are currently the largest growing segment of the disabled college population, there is a significant need for trained personnel to develop, implement, and evaluate college programs for this population. Many postsecondary institutions are presently in the process of program development resulting in the need for an increased number of trained staff to both coordinate these programs and provide direct service to the LDA student. The literature review also noted the critical need for increased training efforts in this area and stressed the importance of input from special education professionals in research, technical assistance, personnel preparation as well as direct service issues.

An intensive literature review focused on identification of sources of referral, and crossdisciplinary approaches for learning disabled students. As part

of the initial identification process, in-take interviews are given by over 95 percent of the California Community College Special Education Department (Ostertag, 1982); therefore, sources of referral for LDA students were easily identified. Ostertag (1986) identified five major sources of referral for LDA students in Community Colleges in rank order, they were: 1) Faculty, 2) Counselors, 3) High Schools, 4) Department of Rehabilitation, 5) Parents/Relatives, and the LDA students themselves.

A review of the studies by Ostertag (1982, 1984, 1986), Hartman and Krulwich (1984), Johnston (1986), Abrams and Jernigan (1984) and Shaw and Norlander (1985) were utilized in developing the category areas for the sources of referral.

## Findings From the Data Analysis

Table 1 indicates in rank order, the total number and percent of identified sources of referral for learning disabled students (LDA) for the fall 1986 semester. Seventy-three LDA students were identified and the data pertinent to the sources of referral from their case folder was utilized for this study. Sixty-seven student case folders had the source of referral clearly identified. Six folders did not contain the needed documentation. The students were contacted and questioned as to the referral source to the Special Education Department. The sources of referral were categorized as follows: division (Oxnard College's departmental internal organization); high school,

peers, Department of Social Welfare, self-referral, parents/relatives, and Department of Rehabilitation. The largest source of referral was noted to be the college's own divisions, with local high schools ranking second, other (peers and Department of Social Welfare) ranking third, self-referrals fourth, parents/relatives fifth, and the Department of Rehabilitation referring to the least number of students.

Table 1

Source of Referral for
Oxnard College LDA Student
(In Rank Order)

| Referral Source | Total No. Referred | Percent of LDA students referred by that source |
|---|---|---|
| Division | 37 | 51 |
| High School | 17 | 23 |
| Other | | |
| -Peer (s) | 10 | 14 |
| -Department of Social Welfare | 2 | 3 |
| Self-Referral | 4 | 5 |
| Parents/Relatives | 2 | 3 |
| Department of Rehabilitation | 1 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 73 | 100 |

Table 2 identifies in rank order, the number and percent of referrals made from campus divisions. The four areas identified, in rank order, from the most to least

referrals were: Math/Science, Vocational/Technical, Counseling and Essential Skills. Thirty-seven out of the seventy-three (total number of students) were identified as referred by campus divisions.

Table 2

Source of Referral for
Oxnard College LDA Student
From Campus Divisions
(In Rank Order)

| Division | Total No. Referred | Percent Referred by that source |
|---|---|---|
| Math/Science | 18 | 49 |
| Vocational/Technical | 12 | 33 |
| Counseling | 5 | 13 |
| Essential Skills | 2 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 37 | 100 |

## DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study indicated that the sources of referral for LDA students at Oxnard College, in rank order, were: 1) Division, 2) High School, 3) Others (peers and Social Welfare Agency), 4) Self-Referral, 5) Parents/ Relatives and 6) Department of Rehabilitation. The sources of referral on campus, by Division, in rank order, were as follows: 1) Math/Science, 2) Vocational/Technical, 3) Counseling and 4) Essential Skills. The results noted that the largest referral source for LDA students to the Special Education Department was the Campus Math/Science Division, with the lowest being the Essential Skills area. The large faculty referrals are consistent with the study conducted on a statewide basis for community colleges by Ostertag (1986), where faculty identified the most LDA students. However, in Ostertag's study, counselors were ranked second and at Oxnard College they were ranked third among the Divisions, outranked by the Math/Science and Vocational/Technical areas. A surprisingly large source of referrals was that of the LDA's peers. Self-referrals, parents/relatives and the State Department of Rehabilitation were ranked last in sources of referral and the total number of referrals from the three combined

categories equaled only 7 referrals out of the total 73.

The research regarding sources of referral for LDA appears to be limited and precise data did not seem to be readily available for this study. However, this does not seem to be too surprising in that the field of learning disabilities is in the early stages of development itself. Additionally, serving LDA students in the California Community Colleges is an even newer development. Although specific programs for remediating learning programs have evolved at the secondary level, no pattern of consistent programming has emerged in the colleges and universities. In the future, it will be critical for professionals to develop models of intervention at the college level that will facilitate the academic growth of LDA students. The present trend in research related to learning disabilities will need to be broadened to include more complex systems of organization.

The implications of this study can be far reaching for both faculty and administration. Questions regarding the program development and delivery of services for LDA college students must be addressed if the "field" is to avoid replicating the same haphazard development. The lack of continuity of services on a statewide basis for the LDA student in secondary programs must also be addressed. In doing so, educators need to develop new models for evaluating/identifying learning disabled adults that will not only provide constructive information

directly to these students, but also allow for diversity of their needs and flexibility of staffs/students schedules. Furthermore, this study indicated the LDA is a college faculty issue, not merely a Special Education problem. Special Education faculty, however, must be willing to utilize and share their expertise in technical assistance efforts to enhance programming for the LDA student. Finally, the Special Education professional must take the initiative in identifying and educating the sources of referral on their ampus and in their community. In doing so, more LDA students will be made aware of post-secondary services and attend the community colleges.

Based on the findings and interpretation of this study, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. The Special Education Department share the results of this study with the entire faculty.

2. The Special Education Department share the results of this study with the entire administration.

3. The Special Education Department work more closely with the Counseling and Essential Skills Division in providing more background on LDA students--through workshops, seminars and literature.

4. More communication and literature could be shared with the faculty on learning disabled programs, impact on retention, the classroom, and the institution as a whole.

5. Increase the LDA enrollment at the institution

by extended outreach programs to low identified sources of referral.

6. Consider using academically successful LDA students in both community and institution outreach/ information endeavors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY


Black, Lynda K. Handicapped Needs Assessment, Community/ Junior College Quarterly, 6:355-370, 1982.

Chandler, H.N. Educational Issues: Potpourri. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 18:8:498-499, 1985.

Clark, F.L. Major Research Findings of the University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities. Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities Research Report No. 31, October, 1981.

Cordoni, B.K. Post-Secondary Education: Where Do We Go From Here? Journal of Learning Disabilities, 15:5:265, May 1982.

Fielding, P.M. A National Directory of Four Year Colleges, Two Year Colleges and Post High School Training Programs for Young People with Learning Disabilities, (4th ed.), Tulsa, OK: Partners in Publishing, 1981.

Gerber, P.J. Learning Disabilities and Eligibility for Vocational Rehabilitation Services: A Chronology of Events. Learning Disability Quarterly, 4:422-426, 1981.

Hartman, Rhona C. and Krulwich, Maxine T. Learning Disabled Adults in Postsecondary Education. ERIC ED 264 685, 1982.

Johnston, C.L. The Learning Disabled Adolescent and Young Adult: An Overview and Critique of Current Practices. Journal of Learning Disabilities: 17:: 386-391, 1984.

Mangrum, C.T., and Strichart, S.S. College and the Learning Disabled Student. Orlando, FL: Grune & Stratton, Ltd., 1984.

Ostertag, B.A. Services for Learning Disabled Adults in California Community Colleges. ERIC ED 265892, 1986.

Ostertag, B.A., and Baker, R.E. A Follow-Up Study of Learning Disabled Programs in California Community Colleges. Sacramento, CA: Community College Chancellor's Office, 1984.

Ostertag, B.A., Baker, R.E., Howard, R.F., and Best, L. Learning Disabilities Programs in California Community Colleges. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 15:535-538, 1982.

Polloway, E.A., Smith, J.D., and Patton, J.R. Learning Disabilities: An Adult Development Perspective. Learning Disability Quarterly, 7:179-186, 1984.

Salend, S.J., and Salend S.M., and Yanok, J. Learning Disabled Students in Higher Education: The Roles of the Special Education Faculty. Teacher Education and Special Education, 8:1:48-54, 1985.

Shaw, Stan, F., and Norlander, Kay, A. The Special Educator's Role in Teacher Training for Personnel Working with Learning Disabled College Students. ERIC ED 267, 574, 1985.

Vetter, A. A Retrospective Study of Learning Disabled Adults. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Lawrence, K.S.: The University of Kansas, 1983.

White, W.J., Alley, C.R., Deshler, D.D., Schumaker, J.B., Warner, M.M., and Clarke, F.L. Are There Learning Disabilities After High School? Exceptional Children, 49:273-274.